

Facesheet for Grants and Cooperative Agreements Program - 2008/2009
 Agency: BLM - Bishop Field Office
 Application: General Application Requirements

6/2/2009

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Version # _____

APP # 700025

Agency Information

(Carefully read the instructions before completing this form)

1. Agency Information

- a. Agency Name BLM - Bishop Field Office
- b. Organizational Unit
- c. Address 351 Pacu Lane, Suite 200
- e. City Bishop State CA Zip 93514
- f. Federal Id Number 76-0872500 DUNS Number
- g. Agency fiscal year (beginning month and day) October-01
- h. Agency Type (Please check one)
- ☐ City ☐ County ☐ U.S. Forest Service
- ☐ U.S. Forest Service - Patrol District ☒ U.S. Bureau of Land Management ☐ Other Federal Agency
- ☐ Federally Recognized Native American Tribe ☐ Educational Institution ☐ Nonprofit Organization - 501(c)(3) status only
- ☐ State Agency ☐ District

2. Project Information

- a. Project Name General Application Requirements
- b. Is implementing agency same as Agency (Please select Yes or No) ☒ Yes ☐ No
- c. Implementing Agency Name
- d. Amount of Funds Requested Project Cost

Project Request(s) Summary

#	Project Type	Project Title	Grant Request	Match	Total Project Cost
1	G08-01-05-P01	Planning	15,000	14,000	29,000
2	G08-01-05-R01	Restoration Chidago WSA	40,000	41,000	81,000
3	G08-01-05-R03	Restoration Alabama Hills	41,000	14,000	55,000
4	G08-01-05-S01	Education & Safety	28,000	41,000	69,000
5		TOTAL	124,000	110,000	234,000

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY: Version # _____

APP # 700025

3. Contact

a. Project Administrator

Name	Rich Williams					
Title	Program Director					
Mailing Address	351 Pacu					
City	Bishop	State	CA	Zip	93514	
Telephone	(760) 872-5033			Fax	(760) 872-5050	
E-mail Address	rdwillia@ca.blm.gov					

b. Authorized Representative

Name	Joe Pollini					
Title	Manager					
Mailing Address	351 Pacu Lane					
City	Bishop	State	CA	Zip	93514	
Telephone	(760) 872-5020			Fax	(760) 872-5050	
E-mail Address	jpollini@blm.gov					

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Version # _____

APP # 700025

A. Location Map

Attachments:

[Location Map](#)

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Version # _____

APP # 700025

A. Equipment Inventory

Has your agency purchased any Equipment with OHV Trust Funds within the last five (5) ☐ Yes ☒ No
years? (Please select Yes or No)

#	Item Description	Make	Model	Model Year	Vehicle Identification Number (VIN) or Serial Number	Project Agreement Number

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY: Version # _____ APP # 700025

PART 1 - ITEM 1. DETERMINE THE NEED FOR FULL FULL HABITAT MANAGEMENT PROGRAM (HMP)

All Applicants submitting Projects involving Ground Disturbing Activities are subject to HMP requirements. The HMP must cover the combined Project Area of all proposed Projects with Ground Disturbing Activities.

Applicants able to certify that none of the proposed activities listed in the Application in areas open to legal OHV Recreation contain any risk factors to special-status species and/or sensitive habitats shall submit only HMP Part 1. Applicants who cannot certify that the proposed activities listed in the Application in areas open to legal OHV Recreation do not contain any risk factors to special-status species and/or sensitive habitats shall submit HMP Parts 1 and 2.

1. Do any of your proposed projects involve Ground Disturbing Activities? (Please select ☒ Yes ☐ No Yes or No)
2. Can the Applicant certify that none of the proposed Projects with Ground Disturbing Activities in areas open to legal OHV Recreation contain any risk factors to special-status species and/or sensitive habitats? (If you checked 'Yes', you are done with HMP) (Please select Yes or No) ☒ Yes ☐ No

PART 2 - RISK ANALYSIS, MANAGEMENT PROGRAM AND REPORTING

PART 2 - Section I. Summary of HMP Changes

Has the Applicant previously submitted a HMP Part 2 that is currently in use in the proposed Project Area? (Please select Yes or No) ☐ Yes ☐ No

Table 1 - Summary of HMP Changes

Changes from Previous Year	Section Where Change Occurs

PART 2 - Section II - Special Status Species

Table 2 - Table of All Special-Status Species and Any Other Species of Local Concern That Were Considered for Inclusion in the HMP

Species	Listing Status	Habitat	Potential for Occurrence	Addressed by HMP? If not explain why?

PART 2 - Section III - Map(s) of Project Area

PART 2 - Section IV. - Management/Monitoring Program by Species and Sensitive Habitat

PART 2 - Section IV. - Management/Monitoring Program by Species and Sensitive Habitat - Table 3

Table 3 - Data (Including Baseline Data) and Management Program for Species and/or Sensitive Habitats

Species/Habitat	Known Information	Methodology	Concerns / Risks / Uncertainties	Management Objective(s)	Management Action(s)	Success Criteria

PART 2 - Section IV. - Management/Monitoring Program by Species and Sensitive Habitat - Table 4

Table 4: Summary of HMP Monitoring Program

Species/Habitat	Change Detection Methodology	Effectiveness Monitoring Methodology, Including Triggers	Identify Any Applicable Validation Monitoring (Focused Studies)

PART 2 - Section IV. - Management/Monitoring Program by Species and Sensitive Habitat - Table 5

Table 5. Management Review and Response; Adaptive Management

Monitoring Methodology	How Monitoring Information Will Inform Management	How Data Will Be Analyzed	Management Response to Identified Triggers	Who Will Plan Management Response

PART 2 - Section V. - Previous Year's Monitoring Results and Management Actions Based on Monitoring Results

PART 2 - Section V. - Previous Year's Monitoring Results and Management Actions Based on Monitoring Results - Table 6

Table 6: Previous Year's Monitoring Results

Monitoring Accomplishments	Results	Were Objectives and Success Criteria Achieved?

PART 2 - Section V. - Previous Year's Monitoring Results and Management Actions Based on Monitoring Results - Table 7

Table 7: Management Actions Based on Monitoring Results

Management Actions	Species/ Habitat	Date Completed or Planned - mm/dd/yyyy	Changes Needed to HMP

PART 2 - Section V. - Previous Year's Monitoring Results and Management Actions Based on Monitoring Results - Table 8

Table 8 Management Actions Taken in Response to HMP-related Public Concerns

Concern Raised by Public	Actions Taken to Address the Concern

--	--

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Version # _____

APP # 700025

A. Soil Conservation

- a. Do any of your proposed projects involve Ground Disturbing Activities? (Please select Yes or No) ☒ Yes ☐ No

B. Soil Conservation Plan

Attachments:

[Soil Conservation Plan](#)

[Soil Evaluation Form](#)

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Version # _____

APP # 700025

A. Public Notification Efforts

Check all that apply: (Please select applicable values)

- ☒ Notice to interested Parties/Groups (Enter date in mm/dd/yyyy format) [03/02/2009]
- ☒ Published on Applicant's Website (Enter date in mm/dd/yyyy format) [03/02/2009]
- ☒ Published in Newspaper
- ☒ News Release Issued
- ☐ Public Meeting(s) Hearing(s) Held

B. Public Comments

All public comments received were in support of application.

Paul McFarland, executive director of the Friends of the Inyo, commented on the following items:

Comment: "The grant includes a line item of 360 volunteer hours but lacks a discussion or plan for how these volunteers would be will utilized. Before final award, a plan for recruitment, training and use of volunteers for this and any other BLM grants should be developed in concert with organizations or individuals to be relied on for volunteering or volunteer coordination."

Response: We are currently working on such a plan to recruit, train and utilize volunteers.

Comment: "The largest Planning need in the Bishop BLM Field Office is the creation of a legally designated system of roads, trail and areas (i.e. Travel management or route designation). A designated system forms the foundation for any and all management of motorized recreation on public lands. While BLM has completed designations on a limited area around Bishop, the remainder of the field office lacks a coherent, legally designated system. Many of the pieces of the designation puzzle do exist - a near complete 1990-era inventory and proposed designations, as well as a subsequent 2001-2003 GPS-based Inventory."

Response: Executive Order 11644 requires that all federal lands be designated as "open use", "limited use", or "closed".

The Bishop Resource Management Plan (RMP) completed in 1993, designated all lands as limited use - existing routes only. In addition, there is one small designated open area, Poleta Canyon.

Concurrently, and subsequent to the issuance of the RMP, the BLM Bishop Field Office undertook planning efforts to address the implementation of the "limited use" designations. In 1991, The High Desert Off-Highway Vehicle Project Management Plan was completed; in 1994, The North of Bishop Vehicle Access Strategy Plan was completed; and in 1996, The Interagency Vehicle Access Strategy was completed. In 2006, a programmatic EA, Off-Highway Vehicle Restoration Project was completed to address yearly restoration projects the field office undertakes in implementing completed plans above.

These past and present projects have cumulatively improved cultural resources, vegetative and wildlife habitat, visual resources, etc. Additionally, annual maintenance has kept motorized access opportunities available and protected adjacent resources for public appreciation and use.

Comment: "A grant priority for BLM Bishop should be a planning grant to compare the High Desert Route Inventory (limited designations completed around Bishop) with the 2001 Inventory and the nearly completed 1990 joint Forest-BLM NEPA alternatives."

Response: Since the completion of the above mentioned plans, the Bishop Field Office has been implementing its Limited Use designation program. We have taken an incremental approach to the program which has contributed to the acceptance and compliance to all closures. Routes impacting habitat or cultural resources have been closed and restored to surrounding conditions. All planning has been completed, however as conditions change the Bishop Field office responds accordingly. An example would be the potential for the listing of the Greater Sage Grouse. Routes crossing through critical habitat in the Long Valley area were identified in early 2000, closed and rehabbed. Additionally, newly created routes that ongoing monitoring documents as not meeting "Management Theme and Decision" (RMP 1993) are identified and closed. Another example would be the Chidago Canyon WSA Restoration Application. This route was identified as newly created in late 2008 and is now closed. The grant funds would allow us to restore the damaged lands as well.

Comment: "This grant to fund a comprehensive cultural survey of the Alabama Hills is a step in the right direction for the Bishop BLM. Rather than limited to the Alabama Hills, this grant should be expanded to inform the Travel Management process across the entire field office in preparation for the upcoming Resource Management Plan revision."

Response: Due to our current workload and time constraints this is not possible.

Comment: "I am concerned that the Field Office did not apply for any Ground Operations funding to maintain existing opportunities and mitigate resource concerns on open routes."

Response: The Bishop Field Office currently maintains routes and mitigates resources concerns through a mix of appropriated dollars, user fees and cooperative agreements. Through our extensive patrol schedule we identify resource concerns, such as new routes, trash dumps, vandalism, etc and take immediate action to correct the situation.

C. Application Development as a result of Public Comments

- a. Were changes made to the Application as a result of public comments? (Please select ☒ Yes ☐ No Yes or No)

- b. Describe how public comments affected the Application

Changes made to the application from comments received from the Division are as follows:

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Version # _____

APP # 700025

1. Applicant Certifications

A. General Conditions

- A. The Applicant hereby certifies, under the penalty of perjury, compliance with the following ☒ terms and conditions:
1. If the Project involves a Ground Disturbing Activity, the Applicant agrees to monitor the condition of soils and wildlife in the Project Area each year in order to determine whether the soil conservation standard adopted pursuant to Public Resource Code (PRC), Section 5090.35 and the HMP prepared pursuant to Section 5090.53(a) are being met.
 2. If the Project involves a Ground Disturbing Activity, the Applicant agrees that, whenever the soil conservation standard adopted pursuant to PRC Section 5090.35 is not being met in any portion of a Project Area, the recipient shall close temporarily that noncompliant portion, to repair and prevent accelerated erosion, until the same soil conservation standard adopted pursuant to PRC Section 5090.35 is met.
 3. If the Project involves a Ground Disturbing Activity, the Applicant agrees that, whenever the HMP prepared pursuant to PRC Section 5090.53(a) is not being met in any portion of a Project Area, the recipient shall close temporarily that noncompliant portion until the same HMP prepared pursuant to PRC Section 5090.53(a) is met.
 4. The Applicant agrees to enforce the registration of off-highway motor vehicles and the other provisions of Division 16.5 (commencing with Section 38000) of the Vehicle Code and to enforce the other applicable laws regarding the operation of off-highway motor vehicles.
 5. The Applicant agrees to cooperate with appropriate law enforcement entities to provide proper law enforcement at and around the Facility.
 6. The Applicant's Project is in accordance with local or federal plans and the strategic plan for OHV Recreation prepared by the OHMVR Division.

B. Programmatic Conditions

B. The Applicant must describe the following programmatic conditions:

1. Identify the potential for the facility to reduce illegal and unauthorized OHV Recreation activities in the surrounding areas:

Well maintained facilities that include visitor services, trail maintenance and signing attract OHV users. Visitor services contacts provide information on where to ride as well as rules and regulations. Maps are tools used to direct OHV use to areas where use is sustainable. Law enforcement is used within the facility as well as the surrounding area to deter unauthorized and illegal use.
2. Describe how the Applicant is meeting the operations and maintenance needs of any existing OHV Recreation Facility under its jurisdiction:

Operational and maintenance needs are met through a combination of BLM funds, volunteers and OHMVR Division cooperative agreements.

C. Fee Collection

Describe how fees collected pursuant to Section 38230 of the Vehicle Code (in-lieu funds) are utilized and whether the fees complement the Applicant's proposed Project:

D. Compliance with PRC 5090.50(b)(1)(C)

Projects within the O&M category that affect lands identified as inventoried roadless areas by the U.S. Forest Service, are compliant with PRC 5090.50(b)(1)(C). (Please select Yes or No)



Yes



No

2. Governing Body Resolution

3. Land Manager Authorization

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Version # _____

APP # 700025

1. OHV Visitor Opportunity Summary

1 OHV Visitor Opportunity Summary

- a. Does the land manager agency provide legal OHV riding opportunity? (Please select ☒ Yes ☐ No Yes or No)

Starting (Month/Year) 10/2007

Ending (Month/Year) 09/2008

- b. Off-Highway Vehicle Opportunity Ratio (OHV Ratio) opportunity

- i. Months of OHV Opportunity (OHV Months) 12

- ii. Total Miles Of Routes Available For OHV Recreation 2500

- iii. Total Acres Of Open Riding Available For OHV Recreation 1894

- iv. OHV Visitation (visitor days) 642103

- v. Ratio of OHV Visitation/OHV Opportunity 146.13

1 OHV Visitor Opportunity Summary (2)

- c. Reference Document that support the responses to a. and b. on previous page

BLM's Recreation Management Information System contains visitor use data

GIS data base contains GPS route inventory.

Resource Management Plan (1993) contains seasonal use and Open area information.

- d. Visitor Opportunity Ratio (V/O Ratio) = OHV Ratio x OHV Months / 12 146.13

Visitor Opportunity Ratio (V/O Ratio) Score 4

2. Quality of OHV Opportunity

Land Manager's OHV program 8

Check all that apply (Please select applicable values)

- ☒ Map with OHV Recreation opportunities clearly shown is available for distribution at no cost (2 points)
☒ Map with OHV Recreation opportunities clearly shown is available on the Land Manager's website (2 points)
☒ Map indicates relative difficulty of each OHV trail (2 points)
☒ Map indicates appropriate OHV use type (ATV, dirt bike, 4x4, OSV, etc.) (2 points)
☐ At least fifty percent of the staging areas include support facilities (restrooms, picnic tables, trash cans, shade structures) (2 points)
☐ Majority of trail intersections are signed with information such as: trail names, directional signs, relative difficulty, mileage to next feature (2 points)

3. Variety of OHV Opportunity

- a. Skill levels (e.g., beginner, intermediate, advanced) indicated by publicly available maps or signage marking trails with relative difficulty 5

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

☒ 3 or more skill levels (5 points)

☐ 2 skill levels (3 points)

☐ 1 skill level (1 point)

☐ Land Manager has no legal OHV riding opportunity (No points)

- b. Type of OHV Opportunity (ATV, dirt bike, 4x4, OSV, RUV, Sand Rail/Dune Buggy) 6

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☒ Opportunities for 3 or more vehicle types (6 points) ☐ Opportunities for 2 vehicle types (3 points)
☐ Opportunity for only 1 vehicle type (1 point) ☐ Land Manager has no legal OHV riding opportunity (No points)

4. Agency Contribution

Cost of OHV Program for Land Manager's most recent complete fiscal year (not to include cost of indirect overhead): 505000

% Funded by OHV Trust Fund (do not include in-lieu funds): 3

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☐ No OHV Trust Funds were used (6 points)
☐ 10% or less of the program cost was from OHV Trust Fund (4 points)
☒ 11% to 25% of the program cost was from OHV Trust Fund (3 points)
☐ 26% to 50% of the program cost was from OHV Trust Fund (1 point)
☐ More than 50% of the program cost was from OHV Trust Fund (No points)

Reference Document

BLM's Financial and Business Management System.

5. Project Performance

For Applicant's OHV grant Projects which reached the end of the Project performance period within the last two years, the percentage of all deliverables accomplished 5

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☒ 100% of Deliverable accomplished (5 points)
☐ 75% to 99% of Deliverables accomplished (3 points)
☐ Less than 75% of Deliverables accomplished (No points)
☐ First time Applicants and past Applicants with no active Grant projects within the last two years (2 points)

6. Previous Year Performance

In the previous year the Applicant has been responsive and communicated effectively with the assigned OHMVR Grant Administrator by phone, email or personal visit. 3

FOR DIVISION USE ONLY (Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☒ In the previous year the Applicant has been responsive and communicated effectively with the assigned OHMVR Grant Administrator by phone, email or personal visit (3 points)
☐ First time Applicants and past Applicants with no active Grant projects within the last two years (2 points)
☐ In the previous year the Applicant has not been responsive (No points)

7. Prevention of OHV trespass

7. Prevention of OHV trespass - Fence (Page 1)

- a. Is site a completely fenced facility such that OHV trespass into neighboring properties and/or closed areas is prevented? 0

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☒ No (answer items b and c) ☐ Yes (10 points, explain and then skip to item 8)

Explain 'Yes' response:

7. Prevention of OHV trespass - Patrol (Page 2)

- b. The majority of OHV Opportunity areas are patrolled (Check the one most appropriate) 5

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☒ At least 5 days per week (5 points)
☐ At least once per week (3 points)
☐ At least once per month (1 point)
☐ Less than once per month (No points)

Explain patrol efforts (e.g., frequency of patrol, patrol personnel, percent of lands covered by patrols)

Federal law enforcement rangers patrol seven days a week including weekends, holidays and after hours.

Additionally, park rangers and volunteers (Bishop BLM currently has nine active volunteers) patrol on motorcycles or 4x4 vehicles looking for problems, picking up trash and providing visitor services. 100% of the Project area is patrolled at a minimum of 5 days per week.

7. Prevention of OHV trespass - Measures (Page 3)

- c. Measures to prevent OHV trespass into neighboring properties and/or closed areas 5

(Check all that apply) (Please select applicable values)

- ☒ Barriers and/or signing are used to prevent OHV trespass into neighboring properties and/or closed areas (3 points)
☒ Education programs, maps and/or brochures provided to the public address OHV trespass, including respect for private property (2 points)

Explain measures utilized to prevent OHV trespass into neighboring properties and/or closed areas

Bishop BLM identifies OHV trespass as: cross country travel; creation of new routes and OHV use in closed areas such as Wilderness or private property. Bishop BLM has identified problem areas and patrols these areas up to 5 times a week. Paid staff as well as volunteers provides visitor services on-site at OHV use areas handing out information as well as a presence to deter illegal use. Additionally, Bishop BLM has created an OHV Web page with regulations, maps, OHV guides and Tread Lightly! tips. Route closures are generally barricaded to physically prevent entry from OHVs. Where private property is within public lands the boundaries along open routes are signed advising the public when they are entering/leaving public lands.

8. OHV Education

8 OHV Education - Page 1

- a. Education materials available onsite 10

(Check all that apply) (Please select applicable values)

- ☒ Free literature is provided to visitors describing safe and responsible OHV recreational practices (5 points)
☒ Bulletin boards, signs or kiosks, at the majority of staging areas, trailheads, or other areas where the public gathers provide information concerning safe and responsible OHV Recreation (5 points)

- b. Applicant or Land Manager provides formal programs, educational talks, school field trips, etc. to the public to educate them on safe and responsible OHV recreational practices: 1

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☐ 50 or more per year (3 points) ☐ 20 to 49 times per year (2 points)
☒ 5 to 19 times per year (1 point) ☐ Less than 5 times per year (No points)

8. OHV Education - Page 2

- c. When Facility is open, staff are available at trailheads, visitor centers and/or entrance stations to provide information on safe and responsible OHV use 5

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☒ Daily (5 points) ☐ On all weekends (4 points)
☐ On the majority of weekends (2 points) ☐ On major holidays (1 points)
☐ None of the above (No points)

- d. ATV Safety Institute and/or Motorcycle Safety Foundation approved training courses are offered 0

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☐ Weekly (3 points) ☐ Monthly (1 point)
☒ Less frequently than monthly (No points)

Describe Land Manager's onsite education efforts:

Bishop BLM has developed several handouts to target safety, ethics and regulations. The emphasis is to "press-the-flesh" which means talking directly to the recreationalist. We currently have five volunteer trail stewards who patrol the public lands on motorcycles handing out information as well as discussing user ethics and what OHV users can do to protect OHV opportunity. Our law enforcement and park rangers also patrol on motorcycles providing the same services, their presence providing a deterrent to illegal use. Contact is not limited to BLM public lands. Several riding areas are adjacent to public lands are on private property or US Forest Service Lands, and these areas are visited by both BLM paid staff and our volunteer trail stewards to answer any questions. Bishop BLM is a certified Hands on the Land location. www.handsontheland.org 8 outdoor classrooms a year are held teaching Tread Lightly and Leave no Trace to school kids.

9. Website

- a. OHV outreach efforts are accomplished through the Land Manager's website 0

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☐ No (skip to question 10) ☒ Yes (provide URL address and answer item b)

Provide URL address http://www.blm.gov/ca/st/en/fo/bishop/ohv_and_suv_info.html

- b. The Land Manager's website contains the following items 5

(Check all that apply) - Scoring: 1 point each up to a maximum of 5 points. (Please select applicable values)

- | | | |
|---|--|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Map to location | <input type="checkbox"/> Hours of operation | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Safety information |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Visitor facilities | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Contact information | <input type="checkbox"/> News releases |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information on responsible riding | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Map of Facilities | <input type="checkbox"/> Fee schedule |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Seasonal restrictions | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Link to Division Website | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Law enforcement contact information |

10. OHV Outreach

Check all forms of OHV outreach the Applicant utilizes: 3

Scoring: 1 point each up to a maximum of 3 points. (Please select applicable values)

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Billboards | <input type="checkbox"/> CDs and/or DVDs |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Community meetings | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OHV dealers |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fairs | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> News releases |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify) | <input type="checkbox"/> Television |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Parades | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Radio |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Programs at schools | |

11. Natural and Cultural Resources

11. Natural and Cultural Resources - Page 1

- a. Is the Land Manager's OHV area a completely fenced track facility with little or no native vegetation?
0

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

☒ No (answer item b)

☐ Yes (5 points, explain and then skip to item 12)

Explain 'Yes' response

11. Natural and Cultural Resources - Page 2

- b. Resource Management Information System 5

Does the Land Manager maintain a management information system managed by qualified environmental staff that identifies and monitors the impacts of the OHV activity and contains at least the following:

- Ongoing survey/inventory of species
- Ongoing survey/inventory of archeological sites
- Biological monitoring that measures changes in populations
- Components that evaluate the effects of OHV recreation and related activity on the species;
- Recommendations for improvement in species management
- Strategies to respond to changing conditions that affect the survival or reproduction of species? (Please select one from list)

☐ No (No points)

☒ Yes (5 points)

Reference Document

1. California Natural Diversity database
2. California BLM Cultural Resources GIS database
3. Annual plant and animal species census case file
4. Programmatic OHV environmental assessment, various vegetation treatments, e.g. aspen, pinyon, sagebrush steppe related restoration projects. BLM Special Status Species Management 6840 manual.
5. Bishop Resource Management Plan, biological consultation case files (Fish and Wildlife Service)
6. Allotment Management Plan, Range Management Plan.

12. Soil Management

12. Soil Management - Page 1

- a. Land Manager has developed a systematic methodology for evaluating soil conditions of its OHV Opportunities? 5

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

☐ No (No points)

☒ Yes (5 points)

Explain 'Yes' response Bishop BLM has adopted California State Parks 2008 Soil Conservation Standard and Guidelines Trail Condition Evaluation.

- b. Land Manager has developed methods to address soil issues? 5

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

☐ No (No points)

☒ Yes (5 points)

Explain 'Yes' response In addition to utilizing Appendix 3 of the 2008 Soil Conservation Maintenance and Evaluation check list see also Standard Operation Procedures

http://www.blm.gov/ca/st/en/fo/bishop/restoration/rp_standardop.html

12. Soil Management - Page 2

- c. Land Manager performs soil monitoring 3

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☒ Monthly (3 points) ☐ After major rain events (2 points)
☐ Annually (No points)

13. Sound Level Testing

The Applicant or Land Manager conducts, or causes to be conducted, sound level testing 4

(Check only one if applicable) (Please select one from list)

- ☒ On most (50% or more) holidays and weekends (4 points)
☐ At least 25% but less than 50% of holidays and weekends (2 points)
☐ Less than 25% of holidays and weekends (No points)

Describe the sound testing program

Bishop BLM's law enforcement rangers carry sound testing meters for testing on public lands, violations may result in a citation. Bishop BLM also offers free sound testing, no tickets, within the field office resource management area. How to schedule a test can be found on our Web site. Special Recreation OHV permit holders are required to test all OHVs prior to the start of the event and random testing is conducted by field staff once the event is underway. Sound testing is conducted by certified employees trained by Chris Real. Calibration of sound units is performed by DPS Technical Inc.